



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

col

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/608,196

06/30/2003

Masaoki Yoshida

Q76318

8796

23373

7590

08/11/2005

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

PATEL, DHIRUBHAI R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2831

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/608,196

Applicant(s)

YOSHIDA ET AL.

Examiner

DHIRU R. PATEL

Art Unit

2831

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: 4 and 10.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 5-9.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment A.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Dhiru Patel*  
8/9/05  
DHIRU R PATEL  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2831

Art Unit: 2831

***Attachment A***

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed July 7, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the following:

1) With respect to applicant's arguments that " Takiguchi teaches an electric wire holder....the flow of air through the air duct may be restricted by the bundle of wires (see takiguchi et al col. 1 lines 29-46). Thus, takiguchi teaches a wire holder which retains a single group of wires laterally.

The examiner respectfully traverses because Takiguchi et al disclosed the prior art problems ,see figs 8-9 and col. 1 lines 29-46 (as mentioned by the applicant) of Takiguchi et al.

2) With respect to applicant's arguments that " Takiguchi et al fails to teach a wiring member which holds both first electric wires and second electric wires".

The examiner respectfully traverses because Takiguchi et al clearly disclosed that " the electric wire holder 3 laterally arranges and holds a plurality of electric wires 21, see column 4 lines 15-17" and " the electric wire holder in accordance with the present embodiment is for the use of laterally arranging a plurality of electric wires as well as can more surely hold the electric wires, see column 5 lines 37-41 ".

3) With respect to applicant's argument's that " Takiguchi says nothing about any teaching for a wire member which holds groups of intersecting wires".

Art Unit: 2831

The examiner is respectfully traverses because Nakayama et al clearly disclosed " a plurality of first electric wires 6(1) through 6(4), forming a first wire group (see fig 2); a plurality of second electric wires 9(1) through 9(4), intersecting the first electric wires (see fig 2), while forming a second wire group; a first insulative sheet 8, disposed between the first wire group and the second wire group as claimed in claim 1 (see fig 2); **but only fails to disclose a wiring member** , and Takiguchi teaches the use of a wiring member as mentioned above.

4) With respect to applicant's arguments that " the combination at least fails to teach the wire member which holds both the first wires and electric wires".

The examiner is respectfully Traverses because Takiguchi clearly teaches the use of a wire member as mentioned above.

5) With respect to applicant's arguments that " the examiner fails to account for the limitation that the circuitry assembly of claim 1 is accommodated **in the casing body** .

As shown in fig 3 and discussed at col. 3, lines 39-42 of Nakayama.

The examiner is respectfully traverses because at col. 3, lines 39-42 of Nakayama et al clearly disclosed that only L shape terminal 9b be fitted to each hole formed in connector housing 10 and not the connector housing merely receives branch conductors **9a** as argues by the applicant's.

*Dhiru R. Patel*  
8/8/05  
DHIRU R. PATEL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER